

THE DIRECTOR OF
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

National Intelligence Council

18 July 1985

NOTE FOR THE DIRECTOR

FROM: Herbert E. Meyer
VC/NIC

The latest from Charles Douglas-Home.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. E. Meyer', written in a cursive style.

Herbert E. Meyer

Attachment:
London Times article,
"The Terrorist Network"
16 July 1985

THE TIMES TUESDAY JULY 16 1985

THE TERRORIST NETWORK

In their speeches to the American Bar Association yesterday the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary spoke forcefully about international terrorism. "We have behind us many fine declarations and communiques of good intent. We need action; action to which all countries are committed until the terrorist knows that he has no haven, no escape. Alas that is far from true today," said the Prime Minister. Mr Brittan spoke in similar vein. The Prime Minister also referred approvingly to President Reagan's speech last week when he traced a pattern of international terrorism based on the concerted efforts of various terrorist governments to focus their violence on all things American.

Bold words. Alas, the reality of serious and renewed international co-operation after the Beirut hijacking is simply not to be found. Today the EEC political directors meet in Luxembourg. Though terrorism will be high on their agenda there seems to be no prospect of any agreement to proceed with the quarantine of Beirut airport which was first proposed by the United States immediately after the hostages were rescued.

Britain undertook to support the American proposal provided that other nations did. The Government must have known enough about its European partners to calculate that such an undertaking could be safely given and just as safely lost in the tergiversations of the French (who own 28% of Middle East Airlines), the Germans (who say they would need three months notice by which time would it really be worth while?) and sundry other administrative minutiae which look pathetically out of proportion when set against the violence of Beirut.

Somebody has to start somewhere by recognising that the war against organised international terrorism will not be won with reference to bureaucratic niceties. There will always be arguments against doing

anything. They will be made by people who argue that any such recognition would cause over-reaction. Others, including ex-President Carter, have just as quickly rushed in to pooh-pooh President Reagan's thesis about international terrorism before they could conceivably have examined all the evidence.

Hitherto it has been customary to deal with each terrorist outrage either as an isolated incident or else as one which springs solely from the specific rhetorical context defined by the terrorists themselves. The initial mistake there is to accept the terrorist version of events. The second mistake is to apply such a limited analysis to each episode that the broader global pattern of terrorism is overlooked.

President Reagan identified what he described as a "confederation of terrorist states" - Iran, Libya, North Korea, Cuba and Nicaragua - which had a clear strategic purpose to disrupt all American foreign policy, frighten potential friends in the Third World and remove American influence from those areas of the world where Washington's policy was helping to bring stable and democratic government. He did not over-emphasise the role of the Soviet Union beyond saying that Moscow has close ties with these terrorist states. However the underlying implication of this affinity is clear. It is certainly clarified by recent pioneering research into patterns of international terrorism carried out in California by Dr. Avigdor Hazelkorn, whose work is now receiving attention in American strategic circles.

Dr. Hazelkorn's studies vividly reveal the affinity between the terrorist states' strategy to expel American influence from their areas and Moscow's long-term desire to do the same. Currently Moscow's strategic purpose coincides with the terrorist strategy and the mechanism by which Moscow exploits this affinity can be traced through a complex but consistent pattern of high-level visits,

arms deals, declarations of support and concurrent attempts to intimidate and befriend Washington's traditional but vulnerable friends in key areas, such as, for instance, Kuwait.

Moscow's global strategy obviously consists of more than this sponsorship of state terrorism by its proxies. But the surface stability achieved by nuclear strategy in Europe makes it more attractive to stretch American forces and nerve in other less dangerous areas of the world.

In the Pacific, for instance, Moscow is noticeably extending its military scope, with the establishment of the huge base at Cam Ranh Bay designed to challenge and contain Chinese power while incursions into Japanese air space have reached record levels this year. This has been accompanied by persistent attempts to acquire Japanese investments and technology for the development of Siberia.

In the "Southern Strategic Zone" which stretches from Turkey to India, Moscow has seen how terrorist nations such as Libya, Syria and Iran can, of their own volition, be expected to mount indirect threats on American influence by intimidating neighbours such as Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states who would all prefer a close relationship with Washington.

It is always more comfortable, and intellectually easier, to write-off such speculations as paranoid projections undeserving of further study. The evidence, once somebody has taken the trouble to collate it fully, suggests otherwise. President Reagan made a start with his speech last week, which should now be followed up with much more of the available detail. Some people will never be convinced that terrorism is a novel and global threat to our way of life. However, others, given the evidence, might start to concede that such an extraordinary threat deserves an extraordinary response.